



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/777,652	02/13/2004	Chee-Keung Chung	33229-200486	5622
23639	7590	02/01/2006		
BINGHAM, MCCUTCHEN LLP THREE EMBARCADERO CENTER 18 FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-4067			EXAMINER WARE, DEBORAH K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1651	

DATE MAILED: 02/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/777,652	CHUNG ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Deborah K. Ware	1651	

**All Participants:**

 (1) Deborah K. Ware.

 (2) Dr. Fei Fei Chao.
**Status of Application: After Final**

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 31 January 2006
**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*obvious double patenting*

Claims discussed:

*all proposed and pending claims*


Prior art documents discussed:

*US Patent 6,440,420*
**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*
**Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
**DEBORAH K. WARE**  
**PATENT EXAMINER**

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicants' Representative acknowledged that a terminal disclaimer has not been filed and agreed to file a terminal disclaimer as indicated in their response. They had originally intended to file the terminal disclaimer and then believed that they were not supposed to because of the inventive entity was not identical, however, the examiner informed Applicants' Representative that all that was needed to file a Terminal Disclaimer in response to a proper obvious double patenting rejection was one common inventor and that the examiner believed the obvious double patenting rejection is proper and a terminal disclaimer was necessary to overcome the rejection. Therefore, Applicants' Representative indicated to the examiner that an after final supplemental response and terminal disclaimer would be filed to make the record clear and to overcome the obvious double patenting rejection. Examiner Ware also indicated that the after final response and amendment will be reviewed with Primary David Naff to determine any allowable subject matter and that if necessary a formal interview requested by Applicants' Representative will be conducted on Monday February 6, 2006, at 4pm. Further, if the amendment after final does not present any new issues for search and/or consideration it will be entered.